



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/733,326	12/12/2003	Sladjana Petrovic	38898-0059	9081
23577	7590	08/14/2007	EXAMINER	
RIDOUT & MAYBEE SUITE 2400 ONE QUEEN STREET EAST TORONTO, ON MSC3B1 CANADA			JOHNSON, CARLTON	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2136		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		08/14/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.	10/733,326	Applicant(s) PETROVIC, SLADJANA
Examiner Carlton V. Johnson	Art Unit 2136	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 01 August 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
- a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 - b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 - (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL -324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-34.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. Other: _____.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Response to After Final

1. Applicant argues session token is not transmitted with request. (see Remarks Pages 2 -5)

The Williams prior art discloses that the session token is transmitted with the request. The Williams prior art discloses a system and a method for secure session management within a collection of web server systems (web farm) utilizing a session token. The claim limitation discloses that the token is renewed after each use. (see Specification Page 2, Paragraph [0006], lines 7 -9) A session management web service updates the session token with each request received from a browser. (see Williams paragraph [0016], lines 7-13; paragraph [0016], lines 4-7: generate new encrypted session token and transfer) If the request must be redirected to a new server where the requested resource is located (see Williams paragraph [0067], lines 12 -18: redirection of session token and session information, redirection request for resources), then the decrypted session token is transmitted to the new server and the session management web service generates a new session token to be used in place of the previous session token. The new session token is transmitted to the browser with the requested web resource.

2. Applicant argues that a request is not redirected. (see Remarks Page 2)

The Williams prior art discloses the capability to redirect requests from a first server system to a second server system. A service request (despite login request, a service request is still processed) is redirected to a second server for service completion. (see Williams paragraph [0067], lines 12-18: redirection of session token and session information, redirection request for resources)

3. Applicant argues computer readable medium for claimed invention. (see Remarks Pages 4,5)

The Williams prior art discloses a computer readable medium for instructions utilized in the implementation of the claimed invention. (see Williams paragraph [0080], lines 1 -8: software implementation)

4. The examiner has considered the applicant's remarks concerning a system for secure session management within a web farm environment utilizing a session token updated with each received request. The capability exists for the redirection of a request to another server wherein the requested resource is located. And, the capability also exists for the encryption/decryption of session token(s). Applicant's arguments have thus been fully analyzed and considered but they are not persuasive.

After an additional analysis of the applicant's invention, remarks, and a search of the available prior art, it was determined that the current set of prior art consisting of Williams (20030005118) and Bachman (5,907,621) discloses the applicant's invention including disclosures in Remarks dated August 1, 2007.

NASSER MOAZZAMI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100


8/13/07